

COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Friday, September 28, 2007

I. Roll Call - Call to Order

Present were Commissioners Wesley Chesbro, Paul Dobson, Saul Feldman, Linford Gayle, Mary Hayashi, William Kolender, Kelvin Lee, (need first name) Pating, Larry Poaster, Andrew Poat, Darryl Steinberg, Larry Trujillo, and Eduardo Vega

Absent at roll call were: Commissioners Beth Gould, Patrick Henning, Jr., and Darlene Prettyman

II. Appreciations

- Chair Steinberg acknowledged Jennifer Clancy, Jerry Doyle, Carmen Diaz, Karen Henry and Gary Jaeger in their dedication of making Proposition 63 a success.
- Chair Steinberg said that Carmen Diaz's most important contribution was reminding the Commission that this Act is about all people but most importantly children. Vice Chair Gayle thanked Carmen for her involvement in reminding the Commission that a family unit is more than a mother and father.
- Chair Steinberg said that Jerry Doyle had been a pioneer in laying the foundation that led to the possibility of the Mental Health Services Act. He said Jerry Doyle's work was a legend that preceded the Act as he led the effort to review the county plans. He said Mr. Doyle was a driving force behind the Act, ensuring the prevention guidelines had an emphasis on children and youth under the age of 25.
- Chair Steinberg said Gary Jaeger had made an impact on the issues of dual diagnosis and had a lot to do with the Commission being focused on outcomes. Chair Steinberg expressed his sincere appreciation.
- Chair Steinberg said that Jennifer Clancy was one of the hardest working people especially with the magnitude of tasks before her. Chair Steinberg expressed that it took someone with passion and dedication, like Ms. Clancy, to get this Act off the ground.
- Vice Chair Gayle said that he has had a wonderful experience working with Chair Steinberg and said he understands his brilliance and drive. The Commissioners all thanked Chair Steinberg for his leadership, dedication and commitment. Chair Steinberg said that the kind words of the Commissioners overwhelmed him and said he doesn't feel that important or special because this work is a labor of love and part of his life's mission. He continued saying that no one in this world accomplishes anything alone. He said this has been the most meaningful work he has ever done and nothing compares to the magnitude and importance of this service.
- Chair Steinberg closed with saying that his new role provides the opportunity to talk to young people and he is fond of telling students that they have no right to be cynical about the state of this world because one person can make a difference. He said he's not leaving the issue, just leaving the role. Vice Chair Gayle presented Chair Steinberg with the certificate.

III. Revisit prior agenda item to make a decision on the review process on the myriad of county applications that are coming in. Mode and method and level of review of the different elements.

Ms. Lee reviewed the following options that were presented at yesterday's meeting:

- Option 1 - the review team members consist of stakeholders that are appointed by the Commission and Staff.
- Option 2 – the review team members consist of Commissioners who are appointed by the Commission and staff in advisory roles.
- Option 3 – the review team members consist of Commissioners who are the only voting members and advisors are staff and stakeholders.

Commissioner Questions/Comments

Commissioner Poat commented that the stakeholder review should be a part of everything OAC does. He suggested that it should be led by the Commissioners to ensure consistency from start to completion of project. He suggested that the Commission come back for a full review at the time of completion. He said that in measuring by those criteria he would be in support of Option 3.

Ms. Lee said that Option 3 is written for the elements other than the process of review of CSS Education, Technology, Capital and IT Committees so that the Commissioners on the review team would submit their comments directly to DMH. She suggested there could be amendments to those options, which would be referred to as Option 3A, etc. in order to address any issues the Commissioners have.

Commissioner Hayashi asked for clarification of the review team. Ms. Lee said the review team in Option 2 and 3 would be people who read the applications. In the case of Option 3, Commissioners, staff and stakeholders would make the comments. Commissioner Hayashi asked if the review team would be members from the county and DMH. Ms. Lee said the review team would consist of Commissioners, staff and stakeholders, and only the Commissioners would have the vote. This is similar to the process that was conducted in Innovation.

Ms. Whitt said that the stakeholders would be the experts such as clients, family members, cultural consultants that have a good background in PEI with particular populations who could help the staff to see if a plan would be comprehensive and reach the people it needed to reach. She suggested that one review team would be created for PEI and they would make recommendation for funding and bring it to the full Commission.

Ms. Lee said the essential difference of these options is the membership of the review team. The review team would review all of the proposals and discuss it at public meetings, where there can be additional input from the public. They then would make their recommendations to the Commission. Ms. Lee said there was a possible second difference, but she's not as clear on that. She said that Option 1 was created by Commissioner Hayashi and she has not had a chance to have a conversation with her so it is not clear to Ms. Lee what the collaborative process would be.

Vice Chair Gayle said he is going to defer the vote until the afternoon in order to digest the material.

Commissioner Poaster supported Option 1 being there are 600-800 plans that the Commission would need to review. He said PEI is the one that the Commission has expenditure authority over and he thought it would be beneficial for the Commission to retain the oversight and authority on the other issues of the plans.

Ms. Lee said the idea that the consent calendar would occur is incorporated into all 3 Options, which include in Option 1, both the recommendations for funding for innovation and PEI. She said that for the comments for the other components for Options 2 and 3 the consent calendars would only include the recommendations for funding and the comments would be sent directly to DMH however, there could be amendments made to these options.

Commissioner Feldman expressed concern about Option 1, 2 and 3 as follows:

- In Option 1 it would be difficult to appoint stakeholders and avoid conflict of interest. It is hazardous to put Commissioners in the position of appointing stakeholders, which means there are others that are not appointed which could result in conflict and antagonism and other problems.
- It is important for Commissioners to have review and approval authority over expenditures of funds.

Commissioner Feldman suggested the following to remedy his concerns:

- Commissioners would review and recommend approval to the overall Commission on a review team.
- Stakeholder involvement should happen at a different level and counties would be required to submit their plans to the communities and stakeholders for comment and at that time submit their plan to the Commission.
- When the Commission reviews the application of the county it would have the comments from stakeholders.

Commissioner Feldman said he perceives the review committee as having several functions, one of which is a transfer of knowledge between the review team. Second, because PEI has this awesome task, a review committee would exercise oversight and consistency responsibility that the whole Commission could not do. He suggested the Commission delegate some responsibility to get things accomplished expeditiously.

Ms. Whitt said that the process focused on 4 main discussion points, which included:

- Who is on the review team;
- What level of information goes back to the Commission as a whole;
- The use of a consent calendar;
- Should there be a review committee such as what Commissioner Feldman described.

Commissioner Chesbro said he is torn on one hand that the Commissioners intense involvement in CSS help build the institutional involvement, however, questioned if there was a lack of time for an adequate review by the Commissioners.

IV. MHSA Higher Education Prevention Proposal

Aaron Carruthers introduced himself as working for Senator Steinberg and the Student Mental Health Initiative. He provided the following information on the background and proposal:

- In June, the Commission voted to approve \$60 million in statewide initiative funds for SMHI. It commissioned staff to convene stakeholders to identify ways both higher education and K through 12 could utilize services. This proposal is the result of the stakeholder process.
- The purpose of the Student Mental Health Initiative is a one time funding to quickly focus resources on the mental health needs of students and to advance the collaboration between educational settings and county services which should form the foundation for future MHSA efforts. The stakeholder process spanned 3 months; divided itself into 2 individual stakeholder processes, one for higher education and one for the k-12 focus,

which included clients, students and parents; additionally it involved representatives from 50 organizations which participated in person. The stakeholders crafted the contents of the initiative and he recommended they be involved in the individual grant proposals as it progresses.

- University and college students are presenting mental health issues with greater frequency and complexity. There has been a lack of appropriate support for students who are faced with significant developmental challenges, emotional stress and mental health risks. At higher educational institution students' risk of suicide had risen. He said in K-12 students it is important to create some upstream prevention, the earlier the services can be provided, the more effective.
- The proposal is \$60 million dollars set aside from the \$245 million dollars that the mental health directors have taken out of the PEI for statewide projects. The \$60 million will be divided up over 4 years and the first of the grants will be awarded in July of 2008.
- The proposal for higher education students is \$34 million dollar which consists of three components. They are: training, peer support and suicide prevention. The allocation breakdown us 6 system-wide grants of \$500,000 creating \$3 million annually, 50 campus based grants of \$100,000 for \$5 million annually and evaluation set aside of \$500,000 annually which comes to \$8.5 million annually and \$34 million over 3 years. K-12 proposal decided they want to take the money as a one time unique opportunity to bring together the variety of discreet school based mental health interventions and programs that currently exist and combine them into a comprehensive mental health program. This would be eligible for a single school, a cluster of schools or an entire district. It is estimated that there would be 20 annual grants ranging from \$100,000 to \$350,000, dependent upon the school's size and need. Allocation for K-12 is approximately 20 district-wide or school based grants ranging between \$100,000 to \$350,000 annually for \$5.5 million, technical assistance available for \$500,000 annually and evaluation set aside for \$500,000 annually which is \$6.5 million in annual funding and \$26 million in four year funding.
- Mr. Carruthers said evaluation is needed and required by the Act and it is mandatory. He reported that the suggestion was that the Commission hold on to the evaluation money for the higher education and K-12, which would result in \$2 million for each program for a total of \$4 million for evaluation. The Commission would receive annual progress reports with a final report during the fourth year. These evaluations would cover performance and outcome measures.
- A next step, what has not yet been decided on, is the implementation of the student health initiative, and how the initiative gets from the state level to each of the campuses still needs to be determined. The staff recommended that the government partners contract out with a professional granting agency to do this. There has been concern from DMH that doing direct granting would put them into a new role. The next recommendation is that the Commission views this as a statewide project and involves all three agencies and their views. DMH could continue to be involved in review and implementation.

Commissioners Questions/Comments:

Commissioner Hayashi suggested that this should not be an effort to just hire more counselors. Mr. Carruthers said that has been addressed and the proposal is more creative than adding staff.

Mr. Carruthers said this effort is specifically designed to push education institution into the larger MHSA efforts so they can then be part of their local stakeholder process for both PEI and CSS

dollars, but they are also in a field that they are competing with all the other needs. He said that any unused money would revert back to campus-based grants which encourage creativity to have multiple system wide efforts.

Public Comment

Kathleen Gutierrez, of the California School Health Centers Association, said that mental health is an issue that should never be taken for granted. She said the SMHI would provide the stigma reduction necessary to allow high school students to be more receptive and to learn more about health and mental health issues of others. On higher education campuses SMHI can end the popular belief that suicide attempts are part of the “college drama”. Most importantly youth need to be heard in the drafting of policies.

Serena Clayton, California School Health Centers Association, Executive Director said the goal of her organization is to come to a time where the health services delivered in schools are integral part of the medical care system, the mental health care system, the education system and the public health system and supported the SMHI. She commented that in some districts it would be more beneficial for a community organization to receive funds on their behalf for a matter of efficiency. It would be beneficial to bring the mental health directors into the evaluation component on this issue in order to help integrate the practices and programs into their PEI programs for the long term.

Jan Ryan, Riverside County Department of Mental Health, Prevention Services Consultant, said this process is important because it brings stakeholders into the process. On the suicide initiative it was said that EAP was a vehicle service delivery and suggested the possibility existed for K-12 and higher education campuses. She said Student Assistant Programs is a very important idea and is supported by several state agencies. She suggested that the SHMI was a consumer movement and the schools need to learn about consumerism.

Stephanie Welch, representing the California Mental Health Directors Association, said that this was a very extraordinary and inclusive process. She said they are supportive of the recommendations that have been outlined for the Commissioners. She said she appreciated the comments on evaluation and thinks it is important to work with appropriate evaluators to capture long- term outcomes. She is very pleased with the peer-to-peer component in the higher education piece. She said that evaluation is the most exciting piece of the initiative.

Becky Perelli supported the initiative. She said specific to the colleges, they are doing a lot of collaboration and feels this is an opportunity to strengthen these resources and results. One of the outcomes would be access, which is hard to measure.

Delphine Brody, California Network of Mental Health Clients, shared comments on behalf of Laurel Mildred who wrote the proposal of the SMHI and later participated in the stakeholder process. She said the process involved clients, students, parents and representatives from over 45 different organizations soliciting meaningful input. They appreciated the addition of the phrase “including appropriate treatment of adult students’ privacy”. They believe there should be a minimum requirement of 25% cash contribution to promote buy-in. She said that educational institutions participating needed to make a solid commitment of resources to the project in order to ensure the best results.

Carol Hood, State Department of Mental Health, said the presentation implied that the OAC was going to have the lead role in contracting with grants administrators to implement these services and there have been questions raised if that is the correct role for OAC. If the OAC is implementing, then who is providing the oversight? She said that the staff from the 4 governmental organizations has responsibility for implementing the MHSA. They have been

meeting and looking at what the roles and responsibilities should be. They have developed a recommendation that will be brought to a joint meeting of representatives of those groups on October 15, 2007.

Arnulfo Medina, California Family Resource Association, said they shared an interest in collaborating with the K-12 and higher education entities. He said they supported the school based programs, especially the recommendations to collaborate with community based programs and family resource associations. He said in higher education they support the peer to peer support, and bringing resources to the campus, and the use of the funds to address and promote acceptance of cultural diversity and empowerment strategies specifically among the ethnic minority communities.

Dina Redman, School of Social Work at San Francisco State University, said she has seen over the past 7 years at SFSU a vast increase in the number of students facing mental health issues and meeting their needs has posed an increasing challenge. She said she keeps hearing that the students with mental health issues are dangerously underserved. She said that at the same time speaking to the design of the initiative, the students that are contending with mental health issues frequently fail to avail themselves in services and supports that are labeled psychological counseling or disability resources due to stigma, a lack of identification with the problem descriptions, or conflict with cultural norms and expectations. She said what she envisioned with this kind of model is that services would be available through the length of time that students are enrolled and should include academic coaching and community building and socialization through peer mentoring and support to help reinforce the integration of students into the academic environment. She said students should be, and could be, referred when necessary to psychological and disability related resources. Having more supplemental services like the ones in the initiative would allow for more intensive interventions to be conserved for the students who could most benefit from them. She said there is a profound need for greater education among faculty, staff and administrators as to how to most effectively serve the students with mental health issues and this initiative would provide them with ongoing training and education.

MOTION: Vice Chair Gayle moved, seconded by Chair Steinberg to adopt formal position regarding the MHSA Higher Education Prevention Proposal Report. Roll Call Vote: Commissioner Chesbro - Yes, Commissioner Dobson - Yes, Commissioner Feldman - Yes, Commissioner Gayle - Yes, Commissioner Hayashi - Abstain, Commissioner Kolender - Yes, Commissioner Lee - Yes, Commissioner Pating - Yes, Commissioner Poaster - Yes, Commissioner Poat - Yes, Commissioner Trujillo - Abstain, Commissioner Vega - Yes . 10 yes's, 2 abstentions. Motion carries.

Chair Steinberg said that the chair succession process will be agendized for the October meeting. The Vice Chair and Chair have put together a search committee made up of Commission members to begin the process of hiring a new Executive Director. Any new Commissioners having interest in the search committee should contact staff. Commissioner Trujillo volunteered to sit on the search committee. Chair Steinberg said that anything dealing with process has to be in an open session. Chair Steinberg said Vice Chair Gayle will be acting Chair until there is an election and everybody is eligible to run for that office.

Previous Day's Agenda Item of 3 Options

Commissioner Dobson said that there have been a number of suggestions of different proposals and each component and the possibility existed of having hundreds of scenarios. He suggested they agree and have a consensus of certain points that would be in any review process without coming to the result that staff would come back with, which are:

- The first item was they would not have, as part of a review team at any level, a person other than Commissioners or staff or consultants hired by the Commission. They are not excluding the public review or the stakeholder review.
- The second item was that they could differentiate between two types of reviews. To have reviews of the programs for Commission comment and the ones where the Commission approves the funding. He suggested that staff prepare a report for Commission vote.
- The third item was the consent item: with respect to certain things that should be considered to be delegated and put on consent calendar wherein the Commissioners concerns be dealt with at that time.
- The fourth thing was that Commissioners could be assigned to any type of review team at the option of the Commissioner and assist even if it was made up of staff and consultants.

Commissioner Dobson said that these items should go back to staff to provide reports and recommendations to be brought back to the next meeting. He said the purpose of this was not to be binding, but to have the basic issues.

Commissioner Feldman agreed with Commissioner Dobson saying the stakeholder involvement is important and every county should be required to solicit and obtain stakeholder comments and then comes to the Commission, which would be at the county level instead of the Commission level to avoid conflict.

Commissioner Poaster said that a plan that is submitted by a county under the current guidelines and regulations require that all public comment be noticed in the plan and the county has to respond to whatever comments are made through the public process. He asked Ms. Whitt to come back with some estimate of what the time requirements will be.

Commissioner Dobson said the process should be expeditious so as not to stop the development of services.

Executive Director's Report

Ms. Whitt reported that the Commission is moving into a new chair, there are currently 5 new commissioners, and 3 more Commissioners terms will expire effective January 2008, 16 plus staff are in the process of being hired, interviews and job offers are out, the Commission has been functioning with an interim Executive Director, and the physical office is moving. She reported the following:

- Program Act creates 8 programs which include 5 permanent, 3 temporary that mainly operate on 3 year cycles;
- Community Services and Support functions primarily to provide services to children and older adults, which the formula for funding is established by the counties. Carol Hood will have some funding information for each of the funding components of the Act.
- Housing – the ongoing implementation work group has not started yet, but when applications start coming in it will get going, the applications are out and regulations are being developed and anticipated for a December release. The housing applications were released on August 6, 2007 and CMHDA is doing a survey with their members to see when that first application might be expected in November. The funds will be released over the counter, which means the counties could apply, when ready, there will not be

any application deadlines. There is a review process in place and there will be evaluation over time.

- CSS Plans – currently counties have the ability to ask for contract amendments to their original plans, the exact number of how many of those contract amendments request have come wasn't available at the time of the report, but they are coming in. Per agreement they are having the opportunity to also receive copies those contract amendments requests and participating in the reviews of those requests.

Same thing with CSS implementation progress reports these are the reports that the counties are sending back basically letting them know what progress they have made towards the goals they identified for themselves in their original plan. All but 6 of those reports have been received and the OAC has received copies of these reports and in addition the Department is working on a summary of what they have learned from the Implementation Progress Reports.

- Innovation – the guidelines will be written when they have received clear direction and principles from them, Commissioner Lee and Deborah Lee will be hosting a publicly noticed meeting in October for all persons who are interested in reviewing the innovation paper that has been posted since the spring and the OAC at that meeting will take action on the papers recommendations.
- Prevention & Early Intervention – the planning funding requests came in and OAC adopted a process for how those are going to be approved and the tool that will be used to do it.
- State Administered Programs - currently roles, responsibilities and timelines for those state administered projects are under discussion and the hope is that staff will have something to bring the Commission at the next meeting.
- Proposed Guidelines - are released and DMH has many regulations packages in development both for Education and Training, MHSA Housing program, Capital and Technology and other sort of fiscal simplification procedures. They are all out for second public comment and they are scheduled to become permanent by December 31, 2007.
- Vice Chair Gayle will serve as Chair following Darrell's resignation until January. Then in October the discussion will take place in regards to the new Chair and Vice Chair.
- Staffing they are in the process of scheduling interviews for the recruitment of available positions. The Associate Mental Health Specialist, interviews were completed they have 3 have positions to fill and 3 offers have been made. Mental Health Program Administrator the recruitment is open and the anticipation is to hire that by the end of October. The Public Information Officer I recruitment is done, interviews are done, hope to be making a selection with that as well.

Carol Hood provided funding information. She said they have involved the Public Information Office to try to find a way to have this be more informative to the general public. She reported that the total revenue received is \$2.1 billion; total investments in the California Mental Health system are \$1.58 billion. Ms. Hood said tax receipts in the amount of \$423 million for the prior years had been received and deposited on the first working day of July.

Workforce Education & Training Report

Ms. Lee provided the following information:

- Eighteen months ago she and Commissioner Feldman wrote a paper on what they considered to be the main issues that were needed in education and training of the mental health workforce in order to create the kind of outcomes that the MHSA envisioned.
- The Commission adopted this paper as its official policy for education and training and charged the co-chairs of the Education & Training Committee, namely Commissioners Feldman and Henning, to go forth and do whatever was possible to promote these principles.
- There is an Education and Training Committee that consists of diverse people with expertise from a variety of vantage points in this field that has met three times. They began working closely with the Mental Health Planning Council because they are charged by MHSA with the responsibility of approving the 5 year plan for Education and training so they wanted to make sure they were in alignment with the key principles and priorities that they were promoting.
- Commissioner Henning convened a meeting in January 2007 with the Employee Development Department of the State to make sure they were working in partnership with them in education and training efforts. Warren Hayes, who is the person at DMH that is responsible for education and training, convened a statewide advisory group.
- There have been 3 to 4 drafts of the 5 year plan that have been released with input from Commissioners Henning and Feldman and members of the Committee. The Steering Committee of the HR Committee will be meeting in two weeks to do line by line edit of the latest drafts and she will be participating in that process.
- In June of 2007 the first draft of the guidelines came out for the PEI funds. At approximately the same time, Executive Director Clancy and Carol Hood said they agreed that since they did not have a comment process in place, that Ms. Lee would provide comments on the plans; however, that hasn't happened.
- Commissioner Feldman and Ms. Lee provided a letter that gave cumulative impressions of the first 16 plans. There have been no comments provided on any individual plans.
- There are 34 counties that have submitted applications for funding for planning and early implementation. She has read all of them and made comments. She recommended that because there is no formal comment process in place that comments be provided cumulatively.
- The decision was made by the Department that 50% of the money would go for state administered projects and 50% for county projects with a reserve for future spending for E & T. It is her understanding that the state administered projects is on hold. There are approximately 9 different projects on hold that require legislative notification because they need additional budget authority before they can proceed.
- The four funding categories are: 1) workplace staffing support; 2) training and technical assistance, 3) mental health career pathway programs, residency; and 4) internship programs and financial incentive programs. One of the areas that tend to be emphasized is training and incorporation into the workforce of peers, clients, family members.
- They have met a number of times with Warren Hayes. She had a half day meeting regarding the 5 year plan and she suggested that they differentiate between short term strategies and long term strategies.
- Commissioner Feldman said an enormous amount of work has gone into E & T. The three major parties to this have been the Mental Health Planning Council, DMH and OAC as advisors. He said the transformation of the mental health services and systems in California would not be possible without a significant transformation of the workforce.
- DMH has been extraordinarily responsive and the process has been terrific. He commented that Warren Hayes has always been available and he has exchanged information with him. He gives the process high marks, however, the product gets lower

marks. He hopes that when the finished product of the 5 year plan is done that the input of the position paper would be more recognizable. He noted that the 5 year plan is in its second draft and preliminary. He said there are a lot of good things in the 5 year plan but almost nothing that is transformational and nothing that is innovative. The 5 year plan and the funding guidelines and the 3 year plan all incorporate a lot of suggestions made by stakeholders throughout California. It is a responsive plan but shows no leadership.

Ann Arneill-Py of the California Mental Health Planning Council who has responsibility under the MHSA for oversight of E & T and review and approval of the 5 year plan said they have been working very closely with OAC E&T Committee as indicated by Ms. Lee. They have been reviewing each version of the plan. On October 8, the HR Committee, along with Dr. Lee, will be meeting to review this next draft of the 5 year plan in a very detailed manner and she feels they will begin to achieve some of the changes that Commissioner Feldman spoke about. There are other oversight entities that are working on this closely.

Cultural and Linguistic Competence Technical Resource Group

Derrick Green presented the work plan that the CLCTRG had proposed and provided a slideshow. There is evidence that racial and ethnic cultural groups historically had less access to quality mental health. The CLCTRG will consist of members with extensive expertise in a system approach to cultural and linguistic competence reduction of mental stigma and discrimination and reduction of disparity and access to quality mental health outcomes. The charge of CLCTRG is assuring that all Commissioners have an ongoing focus on the disparity in the areas of access, quality and outcomes in unserved, underserved, and inappropriately served communities. The roles of the CLCTRG is to provide information, and technical assistance to the commission, to ensure that historically unserved, underserved and inappropriately served communities are involved in mental health policy development, and to provide a public forum where those groups can raise concerns, issues and questions while providing recommendations related to the reduction of disparities in California public mental health system.

Mr. Green said that CLCTRG membership will consist of individuals with knowledge and experience in the mental health field and include stakeholders from diverse populations. Efforts will be made to have representatives from different ethnic, racial and cultural groups. The members will serve a 2 year term and will meet monthly in locations throughout California, including unserved and underserved communities.

Mr. Green concluded by saying that the CLCTRG chair and vice chair request a motion for adoption of the group's Draft Workplan to facilitate progress toward work in the communities.

Public Comments

Melissa Murphy, the ED of the Alameda Council of Community Mental Health Agencies said they have a committee with the purpose to work with the county to find ways and implement ways to reduce disparities in Alameda County. Concurrently they are seeing, in California, huge demographic changes. It is being said that the services for the mental health system has been designed for a different population and so they need to look at how things come together and their group/committee is working with the county to address that. They have been talking about the issues addressed in the work plan outline for years and strongly support the plan.

Janet King from the Native American Health Center said that Board of the Committee Ms. Murphy spoke of and is pleased that the OAC has given this council charge to make sure there is some accountability to ethnic groups and expressed that when the word "underserved" is said that it doesn't forget the ethnic groups, native Americans, African, Latinos, Asians and other groups.

She suggested that all of these groups have suffered from legalized discrimination and have mental health illnesses as a result of that history and the mainstream mental health programs currently do not address those histories and so even if the access problem was resolved there would still be a problem of quality of services because those services don't address the histories resulting from these communities being underserved and inappropriately served.

Stacie Hiramoto of the Mental Health Association and the facilitator of a coalition of agencies and organizations that serve traditionally underserved communities and supported the work plan outline.

Arnulfo Medina with the California Family Resource Association reiterated comments of everyone that spoke and the importance of the underserved term to include the ethnic minority communities. The CFRA serve a majority of those communities specifically around the basic needs and services and counseling and wrap around services.

Commissioner Question/Comments:

Commissioner Steinberg said it is a very good outline for the beginning of a work plan and he urged all that have been involved to continue to do so.

Vice Chair Gayle said that they worked hard on getting the outline developed around cultural and linguistic issues but one thing that he discovered when he came to the hotel is that there is an issue regarding consumer and family culture as well. He said he's been feeling under attack because he has a service animal, has been made to show identification which is against ADA. He explained that the hotel threatened to remove him from the hotel and he expressed his concern about mental health care dollars paying for this meeting at this hotel. He said that, as a consumer, he felt he was discriminated against. He said the work plan is not as thorough as he originally thought it was and needs more work to be inclusive of culture of consumer and family members.

Commissioner Vega said the mental health services planning neglects communities with disabilities, in particular people with deaf sensory disabilities and encouraged this work group to take on this issue.

Chair Steinberg said that his Senate District will personally communicate with this hotel about educating their staff about cultural and linguistic competency. He expects a positive response to his inquiries and will report back through the staff.

MOTION: Commissioner Poat moved to adopt the Workplan outline, seconded by Commissioner Hayashi. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Lee asked permission to put this item on a future agenda because the investigators would be very helpful in sharing what they have learned.

Public Comment:

Rusty Selix said that he wanted to flag an issue that is of major concern of the non governmental stakeholder partners that came to light at the July meeting where the draft prevention early intervention guidelines were rushed through and there was evidence that there was a very extensive process of the government partners and the composition of the Commission. Every Commissioner represents a key stakeholder interest and whether it is the Commissioner or the stakeholder that stand behind them, it is important that the decisions that are being made reflect that. The process that was utilized in July didn't seem to do so and the concern they have that the role of stakeholders and the role of government agencies is very messy with the way things have evolved. He expressed concern that they as stakeholders were not given a meaningful

opportunity to participate in the development of that program. The issue that was perceived as most offensive was the Commissions agenda for that Friday had 4 designated stakeholder groups to give a 15 minute presentation on whatever they wanted, the client groups spent all 15 of their minutes speaking about force treatment issues, a woman in the audience wasn't given 10 seconds of rebuttal to that view. They are not criticizing the decisions the Commission made, but to say the way the process evolved and several months of negotiations among the government partners and two Commissioners had no role for any of them.

Sandra Marley a private volunteer advocate agreed with Mr. Selix and brought up specifically public comment scheduling being excluded from this agenda and had been on previous agendas causing confusion amongst the audience. She said co-occurring as it was stated in the OAC report, 50% of the clients have co-occurring, she continued that there is a need for more drug and alcohol education at the junior high level and above for prevention of mental illness. She said she would like to know more on how county gets refunds on relapse. She said that the elderly in the skilled nursing centers that they are seeing more mental illness problems and they want information and training.

Mistique Felton from the Petris Center said they have some preliminary findings on MHSA that they would like to present to the Commission in November and asking for time on the November agenda that are really exciting and have baseline information from Directors survey.

The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability omission meeting adjourned at 3:00